

Witness Name: GAIL LESLIE COLLINS

Statement No: WITN0036001

Dated: 05/11/2025

THE NOTTINGHAM INQUIRY

FIRST WITNESS STATEMENT OF PC GAIL LESLIE COLLINS

I, GAIL LESLIE COLLINS, will say as follows: -

1. My name is Gail Leslie Collins.
2. This witness statement is made to assist the Nottingham Inquiry (the "Inquiry") with the matters set out in the Rule 9 Request dated 27th June 2025 (the "Request").
3. In making this statement, I have refreshed my memory by reading the Incident Log for Incident 0011_24052020 (URN: NGPF0000069), the Occurrence Log (URN: NGPF0000068), the Witness Statement of PC Eustace with photographs exhibited (URN: NGPF0000075), the Witness Statement of Conor **GRO-B** (URN: NGPF0000074) and the transcript of my interview with Calocane (URN: NGPF0000070).

My Background

4. On leaving school I attended Melton Mowbray College of Further Education studying Accounts, Commerce, and Psychology, achieving three GCSE 'O' Levels. I also worked part time in retail at Tesco. On completion of my

exams, I continued to work part-time at Tesco. I also took a further part-time job as a taxi and private hire vehicle dispatcher. I continued with this employment until October 1987 when I joined the Womens Royal Army Corps (WRAC) as a private. I began my basic training at Guildford. I was transferred to Catterick to complete my trade training. I was then posted to Aldershot where I completed two years in Aldershot and was then posted to Lisburn Northern Ireland. In 1990 the WRAC was redesignated and I became a member of The Royal Corps of Signals. In 1991 I was posted to Krefeld Germany until 1993.

5. I left the forces to start a family. My husband and I divorced and I took a part time job in a car dealership. I met my new partner in 1999 and moved to Nottingham. I had a series of jobs in retail and the food industry before joining Nottinghamshire Police in 2003 as a Civilian Detention Officer.
6. The training I received for that role consisted of in-house training conducted by Nottinghamshire Police. The role of the Civilian Detention Officer is to deal with the health and welfare of detained persons in accordance with the requirements of the Police and Criminal Evidence Act 1984 (PACE).
7. I joined Nottinghamshire Police as a police officer in July 2008. The training at that time was a mixture of practical scenarios and classroom input. The Initial Police Learning and Development Programme was a College of Policing training package and was delivered by Leicester De Montfort University and Nottinghamshire Police. Following the completion of the two-year probationary period and the completion of the National portfolio I was awarded a Foundation Degree in Policing and during this probationary period was

assigned to the Response policing section at Carlton Police Station, Nottingham. I was confirmed as a Police Constable in July 2010.

8. In April 2017, following an injury on duty I was transferred to the Prisoner Handling Team then located at The Bridewell Custody Suite, Nottingham. The Prisoner Handling Team is a dedicated team of officers whose role is to further investigations by conducting interviews with suspects and collating all available evidence. This is then presented to either the Custody Officer or the Crown Prosecution Service depending on the severity of the alleged offence. A decision will then be taken by whichever of the two to either charge the suspect with an offence, to take no further action, or to require further investigative action. When the decision is made to charge, the Prisoner Handling Team will assume the responsibility of compiling a prosecution file.
9. My police training included but was not confined to interview training, of suspects, witnesses, and victims; Officer Safety Training; police law, policies and procedures. My training in mental health issues was a compilation of classroom work which included mental health legislation and policies and procedures. In addition, I did a workplace placement at a mental hospital in Nottingham in 2009. My placement at the Mental Health facility was at the Calverton Hospital for Partnerships in Care. This was for the duration of a week. This hospital is no longer run by the previous company and is now the Priory Hospital Arnold Nottingham.
10. To the best of my belief, I had no knowledge of, or interactions with, Valdo Calocane (by this name or any other alias) prior to Incident 0011_24052020

Events of 24th May 2020

11. My role in respect of Valdo Calocane was as an investigating officer following his arrest.
12. On Sunday 24th May 2020 at 15.00, I was assigned by Sergeant Palethorpe the task of completing an investigation of an alleged crime of causing Criminal Damage to a door by Valdo Calocane in a block of flats in a complex in which he lived.
13. Sergeant Palethorpe's role was to allocate incidents to members of the Prisoner Handling Team to complete investigations. The process requires that the arresting officer compiles a handover package with a summary of the case and all relevant evidence attached. In this case, Sergeant Palethorpe allocated at 1500 a package relating to Calocane compiled by the arresting officer P.C. Eustace.
14. The handover package for this incident formed part of the Occurrence Log (URN: NGPF0000068) and consisted of the original Incident Log 0011-24052020 (URN: NGPF0000069), a Prisoner Handover/Investigation report which gives details of who has been spoken to. It detailed that the police had been called by Liam [GRO-B] who had reported he heard banging noises from the flat below his. He reported he had seen the door had been kicked off its hinge and provided a statement, together with the witness statements of Conor [GRO-B] PC Eustace and PC Leggett. I noted that the occupant of number 9 Brook Court, Anna [GRO-B], had refused to provide a statement at the time of the incident. The package also contained photographs of the damage taken by PC Eustace, and an Occurrence Enquiry Log entry completed by PC Leggett at 0257 on 24th May 2020.

15. The process I followed was to first read the handover including the witness statements. I then viewed Calocane's Custody Record (**URN: NGPF0000077**) to ascertain if Calocane had asked for, or was required to have, a solicitor, an interpreter and an Appropriate Adult. I also looked to see if there were any relevant medical issues. I noted that an Appropriate Adult was required to be present during an interview. This decision had been made by the Custody Sergeant and the Liaison and Diversion team. I had no input into why an appropriate adult was required but if there is any suggestion that a person in custody is vulnerable, then an appropriate adult is required under P.A.C.E. 1984
16. I then planned the interview based on the statements and the images taken from the scene. I made arrangements for an Appropriate Adult to attend for the interview with Calocane.
17. I interviewed Calocane at 17.53 at the Bridewell. The interview was digitally recorded and transcribed. He declined the right to have a solicitor present. An appropriate adult, Bridgette Cooney, attended to facilitate the interview and to ensure it was fairly conducted. During the interview Calocane answered my questions but asserted he had no real recollection of the incident. He confirmed that he was not under the influence of drink or drugs.
18. I note that there seems to be a discrepancy between the Occurrence Log and the interview transcript about the name of the appropriate adult. The 18.37 entry in the Occurrence Log was written from my notes which are written contemporaneously during the interview. The transcript is typed by administration staff, and I can only assume the name was misheard. The name of the Appropriate Adult was Bridgette Cooney. Unfortunately, the notebook I

used at the time was submitted to and archived at the Nottinghamshire Police Property Store but when I went to retrieve it for the purpose of making this statement, it could not be located by the Record Support Department staff. However, the transcript is a complete record of the interview.

19. I conducted the interview using the PEACE interview method, which is a structured approach to investigative interviewing. The acronym P.E.A.C.E. Is an interview framework that was conceived by academics and Police to formulate an interview standard in all Police interviews in England and Wales. Every officer is trained in the method. The 'P' in the acronym relates to preparation and planning the 'E' denotes engage and explain. The 'A' is account, and the 'C' is challenge/clarification. The 'E' denotes evaluation. Within the framework several models of interview are used for different types of interviews all falling within the framework A specific model is the conversation management model for use with suspects. This follows the PEACE framework. Calocane's answers were incoherent in many places and his lack of recollection of the incident was said by him to be caused through the stress of his studies. He gave no indication of intoxication or that he was on any form of medication. He admitted that any actions in causing the damage were reckless but not intentional, despite his lack of recollection. The purpose of the interview was to offer him the opportunity to provide an explanation to the circumstances surrounding the incident. Therefore, his lack of coherent answers and loss of memory provided little in the way of explanation. I would not have conducted the interview in any other way.
20. Once the interview was completed at 18.02, I returned Calocane to the Custody Sergeant and he was returned to his cell.

21. Following the interview, I spoke to Sergeant Palethorpe in the Prisoner Handling Team to complete an evidential review. This is a process where all the available evidence is considered and examined by the investigator and the Supervisor, to enable a decision to be made as to what further investigative action is to be taken, such as further enquiries or further interview. Following the review, Sergeant Palethorpe decided that a statement was to be obtained from the owner of the flat. Sergeant Palethorpe also decided that Calocane should be released under investigation (RUI). This is an alternative to bail or release without charge, so that I could arrange to speak to the owner of the flat which was damaged and obtain a valuation for the cost of repair.
22. I did not take any accounts from other witnesses as these had been completed by the officers attending the original incident and included in the Handover package which I have referred to above.
23. I note from the Occurrence Log (**URN: NGPF0000068**) that, on 26th May 2020 at 1106 I added an update referring to the fact that Calocane had been arrested again at some time on 24th May. I did not note the time as, at the time, I was of the belief that I was not able to open Calocane's new Occurrence as it would be a breach of GDPR. I believed I had no legitimate reason to open the new occurrence and I obtained the information from the Custody White Board which shows details of people detained in the custody suite and is maintained by the custody staff. The information I had was that a short time after his release from custody at 1918 on 24th May 2020, he had been detained by mental health authorities under the Mental Health Act 1983.

24. Again, by reference to the Occurrence Log (URN: NGPF0000068), I note that, on 2nd June 2020 at 0020 hours, PC Leggett provided me with the telephone number of the owner of the flat which had been damaged by Calocane. I contacted the owner the same day and obtained his name, Declan **GRO-B** and address. He told me that the damaged door was being repaired and that he would then send me the invoice. I updated him on the position in relation to Calocane.
25. The Occurrence Log (URN: NGPF0000068) shows that I reviewed the case with my Supervisor, Sergeant Palethorpe on 20th January 2021. It was agreed that I would get an update on Calocane's circumstances and contact the damage victim to obtain details of the cost of repair. The matter was then to be reviewed further. The reasons for the delay between June 2020 and January 2021 were that, between 3rd June 2020 to 12 August 2020, I had 48 different cases to deal with. During the same period, my husband and I had to live in with my terminally ill father in law. I was required to self-isolate on three separate occasions between June 2020 and January 2021 because of the Covid virus. In addition, Calocane was hospitalised in Highbury Vale Hospital and no further enquiries could be continued until his assessment and release from the hospital. It was difficult to take the case forward without a clinical diagnosis to establish whether Calocane had the mental capacity to form the mental element of the offence at the time of the incident.
26. On 22nd of January 2021, I contacted Highbury Vale Hospital, where Calocane had been detained on 24 May 2020 and was told that he had been released. Due to patient confidentiality, I was not informed of when or where. I believed he had gone to his mother's address

27. Following that call, the Log indicates that I rang Calocane's mother to obtain an update on his welfare but there was no reply to my call.
28. On 22nd March 2021, I obtained an update from the Liaison and Diversion Team that Calocane was still receiving treatment in the community. I was informed he had had a psychotic breakdown. I spoke with his doctor, Dr Seedat, who provided me with the details of the Community Psychiatric Nurse (CPN), Claudia Birtles, who was overseeing Calocane's treatment.
29. On the same date, I also spoke again with the owner of the flat which was damaged, and he confirmed that he would still like to recover his outlay.
30. On 7th May 2021, I received an e-mail from Calocane's CPN which I cut and pasted to the Occurrence Log (URN: **NGPF0000068**). She stated:

Just to let you know I met with Valdo on Tuesday and let him know about the damages. I think it was probably rather unexpected and took him by surprise, he was also shocked by the sum (£600) believing he had only possibly damaged one door. I am mindful that Valdo really finds it difficult to talk about what led up to the admission, he has never really felt able to discuss it and I think there is a lot of shame and embarrassment about his actions when he was unwell.

He has asked if I can liaise on his behalf and whether we can have a rationale for estimated costs (I appreciate Valdo's recollection of the damage may have been hindered by the illness at the time). I think Valdo is very much trying to move on from the events leading up to being sectioned and I'm just a bit worried this could be triggering for him.

Thank you for your understanding.

31. On 25th July 2021, my Inspector Mark Stanley requested me to update the progress made.
32. There were delays in progressing the matter as the CPN was continuing to work with and assess Calocane and, although there were no other investigative enquiries to be made, the outcome of the assessment of Calocane's mental health was relevant to any decision to be made in respect of charging him, as if he lacked capacity at the time, it would not be possible to charge him.
33. On 29th July 2021, I noted on the Occurrence Log (URN: **NGPF0000068**) that Calocane had e-mailed me and as a result I contacted him to ask him to speak to me about paying for the damage. I exhibit a copy of his email to me as **URN: NGPF0007679** and my reply as **URN: NGPF0007678**. By way of background, in 2021 Inspector Mark Stanley initiated a Pilot Conditional Caution scheme where low level crime could be dealt with without using the Magistrates Court. The scheme involved the offender making restitution to the injured party and in the case of Calocane his agreement to work with the Liaison and Diversion team (L & D) to help his condition and maintain supervision over a set period of time to discourage recidivism.
34. I emailed Calocane again on 28 July 2021 to provide details of my availability for him to attend to speak to me (URN: **NGPF0007679**).
35. Calocane emailed me on 29th July 2021 to state that he would attend at 6pm the same day (URN: **NGPF0007677**). He attended the Bridewell Police Station on 29th July 2021 and I spoke to him alone in an interview room and informed him that the matter had been considered suitable for a conditional caution under which Calocane would pay for the damage caused and work

with L&D to help his condition and maintain supervision over a set period of time to discourage any reoffending. I explained this was an alternative to Magistrates Court if charged. However, Calocane refused to agree to accept a conditional caution and started to display an aggressive tone. He stated that he had not done anything wrong, and he wanted to go to court. I decided to conclude the meeting, because his unwillingness to accept a caution and his desire to go to Court meant that it was not possible to deal with the matter in that way. In order to be able to impose a caution, the offender has to admit the offence and agree to the caution. His admission in the previous interview of recklessness was already preserved but his refusal to accept a caution meant no further progress could be made.

36. On 29th July 2021, I spoke to my Supervisor to review the evidence and as part of that we also researched the second incident for which Calocane had been arrested on 24th May 2020, after he had been released from custody in respect of the incident I was investigating. I read the Occurrence for that matter (**URN: NGPF0000082**). For the first time, I saw the reference to the e-mail letter from Dr Seedat dated 8th June 2020. Dr Seedat had treated Calocane at Highbury Vale Hospital. He stated that Calocane lacked mental capacity at the relevant time to be responsible for his actions in respect of damaging the door. I had not previously been made aware of the diagnosis of acute psychotic illness. As a result of that discussion, it was agreed that I would make contact with the victim.
37. On 30th July 2021, I e-mailed the flat owner to update him. I cut and pasted the e-mail to the Occurrence Log (**URN: NGPF0000068**) I made him aware of the fact that Calocane would not accept a caution and that the matter would

need to go to court. I also raised the possibility, in light of the evidence I had by then seen, of the possibility that the Crown Prosecution Service might not proceed with a prosecution as Calocane was not of sound mind at the time of the offence which can be evidenced by psychiatric reports. I asked the owner to let me know if he still wanted to pursue the matter. I was unaware at the time I e-mailed him that he had sold the flat. I never received a reply to my email.

38. On 23 September 2021, Calocane sent me an email indicating that he might consider a conditional caution (**URN: NGPF0007677**).
39. On 28th September 2021, the matter was reviewed by Sergeant Powar. I cannot remember the detail of the conversation but I believe I told her about Calocane's email of 23 September 2021. She decided that, given the fact that there was a consultant psychiatrist's opinion that Calocane lacked capacity on the day and that the case had passed the 6-month time limit for summary offences because of the wait for Calocane's illness to be treated, the decision was made that the case should be filed. I believe Sergeant Powar was in error with reference to the six-month time limit; criminal damage of a value of less than £5000.00 is not subject to the six month time limit for summary offences, even though it will be dealt with in Magistrates Court.
40. On 4 October 2021, Calocane emailed me asking for a reply to his 23 September email (**URN: NGPF0007677**). I replied to him to tell him that I was trying to get the job finalised (**URN: NGPF0007677**).
41. As a result of Sergeant Powar's decision, I made a closing entry on the Occurrence Log (**URN: NGPF0000068**) on 4th October 2021. The outcome I believe was the only one possible under the circumstances given Calocane's

mental state at the time of the commission of the offence. Even though a caution may have involved the Liaison and Diversion team (L&D), he had by then been under mental health services assistance for over a year and an in-patient of Highbury hospital for 6 months. I emailed Calocane to let him know that the matter had been finalised and that he would not be cautioned because he was not of sound mind at the time of the offence (URN: NGPF0007677). The decision with regard to disposal was made based in part on the fact that Calocane had no recollection of the offence when I interviewed him. His apparent acceptance of culpability following six months as an in-patient at Highbury and his ongoing treatment does not negate the requirement for there to be a coincidence of actus reus and mens rea for a crime to be committed. In Calocane's case there was an absence of mens rea as he had no recollection of the incident because of his mental health. His subsequent tacit acceptance does not change the fact that at the time of the incident he was incapable of forming the mens rea to commit the crime. Sergeant Power clearly made the decision based on all the evidence available. Calocane clearly needed mental health support which he was receiving.

42. I have been asked what my knowledge of any issues concerning Valdo Calocane's mental health was. My answer is I was aware that Calocane had mental health issues because I was aware that he had been admitted to hospital. I had contact with his doctor at Highbury Vale hospital and later with his Community Psychiatric nurse and I was provided with information about his medical condition as set out in this statement above. On 29th July 2021, I

became aware of Dr Seedat's opinion that Calocane lacked mental capacity on 24th May 2020 in respect of the later incident on that day.

43. I have been asked whether details of the attendance and/or decisions or actions taken were communicated to: (1) Health, social services or multi-agency organisations; (2) Valdo Calocane's family; (3) Nottingham University; (4) others who might be affected by Valdo Calocane's actions. My answer is that I did not have any contact with any of the above parties until I spoke to a member of staff at Highbury hospital on 22nd January 2021. I was informed that Calocane had been released from the hospital. I attempted to speak to Calocane's mother on the same date but there was no reply to the call. I spoke to his doctor, Dr Seedat on 22nd March 2021 and he gave me Calocane's new address and details of his CPN, Claudia Birtles. I was informed she was off work sick. I emailed Claudia Birtles on 22nd March 2021 and received a reply from her on 7th May 2021.
44. I have been asked if there were there any barriers to the sharing of information with any of the above, or any other relevant individual, body or organisation. My answer is that the contact I made with Highbury hospital as mentioned on 22nd January 2021 resulted in my being informed that Calocane had been released. However, the person I spoke to refused to give any details about his treatment or diagnosis to assist the police in being able to progress with the case. In addition, the information from the medical practitioners contained within the detention log gave no information as to his mental state only to his fitness to detain. When I looked at the Custody Record, I noted that a full mental health assessment had been requested

while Calocane was in custody, but I could find no record of whether or not this took place.

45. I have been asked if there were any outstanding criminal matters at the time of my involvement in this matter and, if so, what was my knowledge of these and what actions did I take. My answer is that there were no outstanding matters that I was aware of.
46. I have been asked about the fact that I wrote to the victim in this case on 30 July 2021 and whether I consider this communication to be appropriate. I am also asked what enquiries I had made in relation to whether the matter may lead to a charge and the basis on which I concluded that the CPS may not pursue the matter. My response is that I had agreed with my Supervisor on 29th July 2021 that I would contact the victim to update him on the position and to explain the perceived difficulties with the case. I initially tried to contact the victim Mr **GRO-B** by telephone but the call was not answered. I then emailed him on 30th July 2021 (URN: NGPF0000068). The reason I considered email to be appropriate is that all victims of crime are contacted with any relevant updates concerning their case. This would normally be by telephone but, as that was not successful, the next alternative form of communication is email. At the time of writing it, my view based on my experience was the Crown Prosecution Service were unlikely to support a charge in a case where the defendant was lacking mental capacity at the time of an offence which required a mental element (mens rea). I was simply trying to give a realistic picture to the victim.
47. I have been asked if I had any involvement in any assessment of Valdo Calocane, what procedures were in place as to assessment of medical and

mental health issues and drug testing, and provision of appropriate medical support. My answer is that I had no involvement in any assessment and I have no knowledge of what procedures were followed or support given.

48. I have been asked to set out the relevant policies, procedures and criteria which I consider governed my role in relation to this incident and set out the ways in which I consider these were or were not met. My answer is that I acted in accordance with my powers under PACE and the PACE Codes of Practice. PACE is the Police and Criminal Evidence Act 1984. The Act sets out the powers and obligations of police officers in England and Wales in respect of the investigation of crime. Section 60 requires that interviews with suspects should be recorded. Code of Practice C sets out safeguards for the conduct of interviews, in relation to the provision of appropriate adults to assist the interviewee and the availability of legal advice. Code E contains provisions for the conduct of recorded interviews. I complied with all of the relevant provisions of the Act and Codes when interviewing Calocane. I acted in accordance with my Professionalising Investigation Programme (PIP) Level 1 training.
49. I have been asked to set out any concerns that I have in respect of the police's actions in relation to this matter. My response is that I have a number of concerns:
- (a) at the time the case was allocated to me and subsequently, I was not informed of any of the outcomes or recommendations regarding Calocane's mental health. During his period of detention it would have been helpful to have known of the assessment of his mental state and particularly any likelihood of violence towards me or others. I could then

have ensured the safety of myself and others with a second officer with me, with custody staff on hand to intervene if required;

- (b) I was not informed of the ongoing assessment contained within the detention log on the Custody Record. Although it would have been possible for me to view the detention log, it is not usual practice for the investigating officer to do so in the large majority of cases as it normally holds no information relevant to the case. The only information I was given was that following an assessment Calocane was deemed fit for interview. The assessment that he was fit to interview was given verbally by the custody officer with no reference to Calocane's detention log.
- (c) I was not informed of whether Calocane had mental capacity on 24th May 2020 or any ongoing mental health issues until I saw Dr Seedat's letter in July 2021.

50. I have been asked to set out any concerns that I have in respect of the recording of this matter. My response is that, following Calocane's detention in respect of the incident I investigated, he was originally assessed as being unfit to be detained and unfit to interview and that a mental health assessment was required. Calocane was taken to hospital to be assessed and then returned to custody. The information from the hospital was shared with the HealthCare Professional (HCP) but no information was recorded on the Custody Record (URN: NGPF000077). The HCP examined Calocane and deemed him fit to detain but not fit to interview. He was later seen by the L & D Team and a full mental health assessment requested. According to the Custody Log, the assessment was scheduled for 14.00. My concern is that I was not made aware

of any of these matters, which were likely to have a bearing on the conduct of the investigation. The recording of mental health assessments should be done and highlighted in a more user friendly and accessible way to the investigator. It is equally important that the information is available to a defence solicitor, to enable them to advocate on the detainee's behalf.

51. I have been asked if, looking back, I consider there are additional actions that I or others could have taken in respect of the incident. My response is that there were no further actions that could have been taken by the police in respect of the 24th May 2020 arrest. However, I do believe that, in the future, the Custody Record log and detention sheet should be changed to provide greater clarity and transparency. Furthermore, the detail and outcomes of assessments of the mental health of detainees should be included on the detention log to provide investigators and legal representatives with a more comprehensive picture.
52. I have been asked if I consider there are any structural issues (regarding police policies, procedures, methodology, training etc.) which contributed to any issues I have identified. My answer is that, following the closure of mental health facilities and the lack of room in still available hospitals, police officers have now become the first point of contact for mental health crisis in the community. I believe this is beyond the remit of the role of the police and further training on mental health issues alone would not assist, as identification of a person suffering from a mental health issue is not a difficult conclusion to make. Diagnosis and treatment are the responsibility of the medical profession, but there appears to be no consideration of the greater community impact of people being allowed to return to the community without

adequate support. There needs to be a recognition that the police are but should not be the first point of call for mental health.

53. I have been asked if there are any recommendations I consider could help prevent any of the issues that I have identified in respect of this matter. My answer is that I have reflected on this matter and my involvement in it and made a number of recommendations throughout the course of this statement and I reiterate them here. In addition, I would also recommend a review of the Health Care Practitioner provision in police custody. Without wishing to question the competence of HCPs, they replaced the previous Police Surgeon, who were G.Ps called upon by the Police to assess all medical matters in respect of detainees. I question whether HCPs are sufficiently qualified to deal with complex mental health issues. In this case, Calocane was initially deemed unfit to be detained or interviewed, was taken to hospital and on his return deemed fit to detain but not interview, but by the time I was allocated the case to deal with, an HCP had deemed him fit to be detained and interviewed, even although, as I later learned, he was clearly neither. My recommendation is that complex assessments should be conducted by suitably qualified mental health nurses or doctors and not HCPs and that a summary of those assessments are recorded on Custody Records to be accessed by investigators and legal representatives.

Statement of Truth

I believe the content of this statement to be true. I understand that proceedings may be brought against anyone who makes, or causes to be made, a false statement in a document verified by a statement of truth without an honest belief of its truth.

Signed:

GRO-B

Dated: 05.11.2025

Index to First Witness Statement of GAIL COLLINS

No.	URN	Document Description
1	NGPF0000069	Incident Details, 24/05/2020
2	NGPF0000068	Occurrence Details, 24/05/2020, Nottinghamshire Police Force
3	NGPF0000075	MG 11 K Eustace
4	NGPF0000074	MG 11 Conor GRO-B
5	NGPF0000070	Interview Transcript Calocane
6	NGPF0000077	Custody Record of Valdo Calocane, dated 14/03/2025, Nottinghamshire Police
7	NGPF0000082	Occurrence Details, dated 29/08/2023, Nottinghamshire Police
8	NGPF0007677	210721 – 041021.msg
9	NGPF0007678	210721 – 260721.msg
10	NGPF0007679	210721 – 280721.msg